

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1, 4-12 and 14-25. Claims 2, 3 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are amended herein. Claims 17-25 are new. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 14 have been amended to remedy this problem. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider amended claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 14.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) and 102 (b)

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over US patent #5,940,078 to Nagarajayya et al ("Nagarajayya"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

35 U.S.C. 102 (b) Rejection

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for displaying a first graphical image corresponding to a visible user interface for an application program running in a computer system, wherein the first graphical image comprises a full extent and an external boundary of the visible user interface, comprising:

defining the first graphical image in a first computer file, wherein the first computer file comprises a plurality of graphical images and wherein a graphical image corresponds to a state of the visible user interface, and a graphical image can be dynamically updated;

processing a second computer file comprising a plurality of parameters corresponding to the first graphical image, wherein the plurality of parameters define an activation region corresponding to the first graphical image, and wherein an activation region can reside on any portion of the visible user interface; and

processing the first computer file in accordance with the plurality of parameters to display the first graphical image.

Nagarajayya presents a method and apparatus for an “application developer” to choose alternative appearances of an icon box on a toolbar to indicate that an event affecting that icon box occurs (4:14-15, 1:67-2:3, Fig. 2). Applicants submit that Nagarajayya does not teach or suggest a first graphical image comprising a full extent and external boundary of a visible user interface (as recited in Claims 1 and 8-10, and indicated by Claims 12 and 14), a graphical image corresponding to a state of the user

interface that can be dynamically updated, or an activation regions which can reside on any portion of the visible user interface.

35 U.S.C. 103 (a) Rejection

There is no motivation in Nagarajayya to expand the changing appearance of the icons to changing the appearance of “a full extent and an external boundary of the visible user interface,” i.e. the appearance of the whole GUI, as recited in Claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 14. One stated problem solved by Nagarajayya is the object of not taking “space away from the main or parent application which is the user’s primary focus” (1:41-43). Nagarajayya seeks to specifically alter the appearance of the icon alone so that the remainder of the visible user interface is not compromised.

There is no motivation in Nagarajayya to change the appearance of the whole GUI in response to a change in state of the whole GUI. As stated in claim 1, “each of the plurality of graphical images corresponds to one of a plurality of states of the visible user interface.” The invention presented in Nagarajayya is for “altering the appearance of an icon box to indicate that an event effecting the icon box has occurred” (1:67-2:1).

There is no motivation to combine the invention set forth by Nagarajayya with the implementation of dynamically updating images as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 16, for example as described in US Patent Application Publication No. 20020010757. In Nagarajayya, the images corresponding to different events are chosen specifically by the developer (4:14-15) to make the program “easy to use” and “pleasant to look at on the display monitor” (3:1-2). As can be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art of using computer applications, the purpose of a toolbar is to promote the ease of use of the application by displaying menu choices in a visually pleasing, orderly, non-changing way. Over time, the use of the icon boxes in the toolbar becomes routine and automatic. To enable the toolbar to be dynamically updatable would defeat this purpose of the toolbar.

There is no motivation in Nagarajayya to enable “an activation region which can reside on any portion of the visible user interface,” as recited in Claim 1. The invention presented in Nagarajayya is directed specifically to icon boxes residing on a toolbar, with the object of not taking “space away from the main or parent application which is the user’s primary focus” (1:41-43).

Claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 14 have been amended herein to overcome the 102(b) and 103(a) rejections, as discussed in detail, above. Claims 4-7, 9, and 17-23 are dependent on claim 1. Claim 11 is

dependent on claim 10. Claim 16 is dependent on Claim 15, which has not been amended but is believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above (e.g. "the plurality of images defines substantially all visible portions of the window").

New claims 17-25 recite further limitations of the present invention as recited in claim 1. The limitations presented in new claims 17-25 are not taught or suggested by Nagarajayya. Additionally, Nagarajayya fails to provide motivation for the limitations recited in new claims 17-25.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 4-12 and 14-25 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1, 4-12 and 14-25 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invites the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 12/28, 2004



James P. Hao
Registration No. 36,398

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile